arXiv:1207.1081v1 [math.AP] 4 Jul 2012

Liouville theorems for stable Lane-Emden systems and biharmonic problems

Craig Cowan
Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Alabama in Huntsville
258A Shelby Center
Huntsville, AL 35899
ctcowan@stanford.edu

July 5, 2012

Abstract

We examine the elliptic system given by

$$-\Delta u = v^p, \qquad -\Delta v = u^\theta, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{1}$$

for $1 < p \le \theta$ and the fourth order scalar equation

$$\Delta^2 u = u^\theta, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{2}$$

where $1 < \theta$. We prove various Liouville type theorems for positive stable solutions. For instance we show there are no positive stable solutions of (1) (resp. (2)) provided $N \le 10$ and $2 \le p \le \theta$ (resp. $N \le 10$ and $1 < \theta$). Results for higher dimensions are also obtained.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.

Key words: Biharmonic,entire solutions, Liouville theorems, Stability, Lane-Emden Systems.

1 Introduction

In this article we examine the nonexistence of positive classical stable solutions of the system given by

$$-\Delta u = v^p, \qquad -\Delta v = u^\theta, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{3}$$

where $1 < p \leq \theta$. We also examine the nonexistence of positive classical stable solutions of the fourth order equation given by

$$\Delta^2 u = u^\theta \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{4}$$

where $\theta > 1$. For our approach we prefer to recast this scalar equation into the framework of (3). So towards this suppose $1 < \theta$ and $0 < u$ is a smooth solution of (4). Define $v := -\Delta u$. By [26] $v > 0$ and hence $(u, v) := (u, -\Delta v)$ is a smooth positive solution of (3) with $p = 1$.

We now define the notion of a stable solution and for this we prefer to examine a slight generalization of (3) given by

$$-\Delta u = f(v), \qquad -\Delta v = g(u), \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{5}$$

where f, g are positive and increasing on $(0, \infty)$.

Definition 1. *We say a smooth positive solution (u, v) of (5) is stable provided there exists $0 < \zeta, \chi$ smooth with*

$$-\Delta \zeta \geq f'(v)\chi, \qquad -\Delta \chi \geq g'(u)\zeta \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{6}$$

This definition is motivated from [22], also see (12). Note that this notion is closely related to the linearized stability of (5).

Remark 1. *Note that the standard notion of a stable positive solution of $\Delta^2 u = u^\theta$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, is that*

$$\int \theta u^{\theta-1}\gamma^2 \leq \int (\Delta\gamma)^2, \tag{7}$$

for all $\gamma \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, which differs from our notion. We won't show that a stable solution in this classical sense implies stability in our sense but we do show the following, see Lemma 8: suppose u is as above. Set $(u, v) := (u, -\Delta u)$. Then (u, v) is a positive solution of (3) with $p = 1$ and which satisfies: for all $R > 0$ there is $\zeta_R, \chi_R > 0$ in $B_R := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| < R\}$ with $-\Delta\zeta_R \geq \chi_R$, $-\Delta\chi_R \geq \theta u^{\theta-1}\zeta_R$ in B_R.

This notion of stability will be sufficient to prove the stability inequality (17) which is the starting point for our approach, see Remark 5.

We define some parameters before stating our main results. Given $1 \leq p \leq \theta$ we define

$$t_0^- := \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} - \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1} - \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}}},$$

$$t_0^+ := \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} + \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1} - \sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}}}.$$

Properties of t_0^-, t_0^+:
(i) $t_0^- \leq 1 \leq t_0^+$ and these inequalities are strict except when $p = \theta = 1$.
(ii) t_0^- is decreasing and t_0^+ is increasing in $z := \frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}$ and $\lim_{z\to\infty} t_0^- = \frac{1}{2}$.

We now state out main theorem.

Theorem 1. *(Lane-Emden System)*

1. *Suppose* $2 \leq p \leq \theta$ *and*
$$N < 2 + \frac{4(\theta+1)}{p\theta - 1} t_0^+. \tag{8}$$
Then there is no positive stable solution of (3). In particular there is no positive stable solution of (3) for any $2 \leq p \leq \theta$ *if* $N \leq 10$*; see Remark 2.*

2. *Suppose* $1 < p \leq \theta$, $2t_0^- < p$ *and (8) holds. Then there is no positive stable solution* (u, v) *of (3) with* u *bounded. If* $\theta \geq 2$ *one can drop the requirement that* u *is bounded.*

Theorem 2. *(Fourth Order Scalar Equation) Suppose that* $1 = p < \theta$ *and*
$$N < 2 + \frac{4(\theta+1)}{\theta - 1} t_0^+. \tag{9}$$
Then there is no positive stable solution of (3). In particular there is no positive stable solution of (3), when $p = 1$*, for any* $1 < \theta$ *if* $N \leq 10$.

Remark 2. *We are interested in obtaining lower bounds on the right hand side of (8), in the case where* $2 \leq p \leq \theta$*, and so we set* $f(p, \theta) := \frac{4(\theta+1)}{p\theta-1} t_0^+$. *We rewrite* f *using the change of variables* $z = \frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}$ *to arrive at*
$$\tilde{f}(p, z) = \frac{4p}{z - p}\left(\sqrt{z} + \sqrt{z - \sqrt{z}}\right),$$
and the transformed domain is given by
$$\mathcal{D} = \{(p, z) : p \geq 2,\ p^2 \leq z \leq p^2 + p\}.$$

Set $p_1(z) := \frac{-1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{1+4z}}{2}$, $p_2(z) = \sqrt{z}$ *and note that* p_1 *and* p_2 *are the left and right curved part of* $\partial \mathcal{D}$. *A computer algebra system easily shows that* $\tilde{f} > 8$ *on* $\partial \mathcal{D}$. *Note that* $\partial_p \tilde{f} \neq 0$ *on* $\mathcal{D}$ *and so for each* $z > 6$ *we have*

$$\min\{\tilde{f}(p,z) : p_1(z) \le p \le p_2(z)\} \ge \min\{\tilde{f}(p_1(z),z), \tilde{f}(p_2(z),z)\} > 8,$$

and hence we can conclude that $\tilde{f} > 8$ *on* $\mathcal{D}$ *which gives us the desired result.*

There has been much work done on the existence and nonexistence of positive classical solutions of

$$-\Delta u = u^\theta, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{10}$$

for instance see [5], [6], [17],[18]. It is known that there are no positive classical solutions of (10) under various decay assumptions as $|x| \to \infty$ provided that

$$1 < p < \frac{N+2}{N-2},$$

and in the case of $N = 2$ there is no positive solution for any $p > 1$. We further remark that this is an optimal result. It is well known that a Liouville theorem related to (10) implies apriori estimates of solutions of the same equation on a bounded domain, see [5], [17].

In [15] the equation

$$-\Delta u = |u|^{\theta-1}u, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{11}$$

was examined. They completely classified the finite Morse index solutions of (11). It was shown there exists nontrivial finite Morse index solutions of (11) if and only if $N \ge 11$ and $\theta \ge \theta_{JL}$ where θ_{JL} is the so called Joseph-Lundgren exponent.

In [27] the nonexistence of stable solutions (in the standard sense, see Remark 1) of (4) was examined. It was shown that there is no positive stable solutions of (4) provided either: $N \le 8$ or $N \ge 9$ and $1 < \theta < \frac{N}{N-8} + \varepsilon_N$ where ε_N is some positive, but unknown parameter.

As mentioned above Liouville theorems are extremely useful for the existence of apriori estimates. One may ask the justification of adding the extra condition that the solutions be stable, which we now address.

Suppose one is interested in solutions of

$$(Q)_\lambda \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f(u) & \text{in } \Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^N, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

where λ is a positive parameter and f is a positive smooth convex increasing nonlinearity which is superlinear at ∞. This equation is now well understood, see [1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 14, 16, 20, 21, 23]. We now list some properties of $(Q)_\lambda$. It is well known there exists a critical parameter $0 < \lambda^* < \infty$ such that for all $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ there exists a smooth solution of $(Q)_\lambda$ and for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ there are no weak solutions of $(Q)_\lambda$. For each $0 < \lambda < \lambda^*$ there exists a smooth minimal (in the pointwise sense) solution u_λ which is increasing in λ. This allows ones to define the extremal solution $u^*(x) := \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \lambda^*} u_\lambda(x)$, which can be shown to be a weak solution of $(Q)_{\lambda^*}$. The question of the whether u^* is a classical solution or a singular weak solution is a delicate issue and either case is possible as examples show. In trying to prove u^* is a classical solution one needs to utilize the fact that u^* is a minimal solution of $(Q)_{\lambda^*}$ and it can be shown that this implies u^* is a stable solution in the sense that the linearized operator $L := -\Delta - \lambda^* f'(u^*)$ has a nonnegative first eigenvalue in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Since L is self adjoint this translates into the stability inequality

$$\int \lambda^* f'(u^*) \phi^2 \leq \int |\nabla \phi|^2,$$

for all $\phi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. We now suppose $f(u) = (u+1)^\theta$ where $1 < \theta$. There are generally two approaches in trying to show that u^* is a classical solution. The first is to use the stability inequality to obtain sufficient integral estimates on u^* to imply u^* is bounded. The second approach is to use a rescaling argument: suppose u^* is not a classical solution and so there is $\lambda_m \nearrow \lambda^*$ and $x_m \in \Omega$ such that $u_{\lambda_m}(x_m) = \max_\Omega u_{\lambda_m} = T_m \to \infty$. We now set

$$v_m(x) := \frac{u_{\lambda_m}(x_m + r_m x)}{T_m}, \qquad x \in \Omega_m := \{x : x_m + r_m x \in \Omega\},$$

and where $\lambda_m r_m^2 T_m^{\theta-1} = 1$. Then $-\Delta v_m(x) = (v_m(x) + T_m^{-1})^\theta$ in Ω_m and $0 \leq v_m \leq 1$ in Ω_m with $v_m(0) = 1$. The stability of u_{λ_m} implies the stability of v_m and passing to the limit shows that v_m converges to a nonzero stable, bounded solution of $-\Delta v = v^\theta$ in Ω_∞ which is either $\mathbb{R}^N$ or possibly a half space. If we assume its the first case, and if we have a Liouville theorem which says there are no positive bounded stable solutions on $\mathbb{R}^N$ then we would obtain a contradiction and hence we'd have u^* is bounded.

We now examine some bounded domain analogs of (3) and (4). We begin by examining

$$(P)_{\lambda,\gamma} \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} -\Delta u &=& \lambda f(v) & \Omega \\ -\Delta v &=& \gamma g(u) & \Omega, \\ u &=& v = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and where f, g are smooth, positive increasing nonlinearities which are superlinear at ∞. Set $\mathcal{Q} = \{(\lambda,\gamma) : \lambda, \gamma > 0\}$, $\mathcal{U} := \{(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{Q} :$ there exists a smooth solution (u,v) of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}\}$, and set $\Upsilon := \partial\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{Q}$. Note Υ plays the role of the extremal parameter λ^* in the case of the system. For all $(\lambda,\gamma) \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a smooth minimal solution $u_{\lambda,\gamma})$ of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma})$ and again one can use the monotonicity of the minimal solutions to define an extremal solution (u^*, v^*) for each $(\lambda^*, \gamma^*) \in \Upsilon$. To show the regularity of (u^*, v^*) we will need to use the minimality of the minimal solutions to obtain added regularity. In [22] a generalization of $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ was examined and various properties we obtained. One important result was that the minimal solutions $(u,v) = (u_{\lambda,\gamma}, v_{\lambda,\gamma})$ were stable in the sense that there was some nonnegative constant η and $0 < \zeta, \chi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$-\Delta\zeta = \lambda f'(v)\chi + \eta\zeta, \quad -\Delta\chi = \gamma g'(u)\zeta + \eta\chi, \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{12}$$

It is precisely this result that motivates our definition of a stable solution of (3). Very recently, in [7], the regularity of the extremal solutions associated with $(P)_{\lambda,\gamma}$ was examined in the case of $f(v) = (v+1)^p$ and $g(u) = (u+1)^\theta$ where $1 < p \le \theta$. It was shown that the associated extremal solutions were bounded provided condition (8) holds. In [9] the fourth order problem

$$(N)_\lambda \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcll} \Delta^2 u &=& \lambda f(u) & \Omega, \\ u &=& \Delta u = 0 & \partial\Omega, \end{array} \right.$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ was examined in the case where $f(u) = e^u$ and $f(u) = (u+1)^\theta$. In the case of $f(u) = e^u$, the previous best known result was from [8] where it was shown that u^* was bounded provided $N \le 8$. In [9] this was improved to $N \le 10$ but this still falls far short of the expected optimal result that u^* is bounded for $N \le 12$, which has been proven on radial domains, see [12]. In [9] we showed the extremal solution associated with $(N)_\lambda$ in the case of $f(u) = (u+1)^\theta$ is bounded provided condition (9) holds. Again these were major improvement over the best known previous results, again from [8], but fall short of the expected optimal results, see [13] for the radial case.

Note that our results in the current work are expected after viewing the recent works on the regularity of the extremal solutions on bounded domains. It should be noted that even if this is to be expected, these results are not straightforward adaptions of the regularity results on bounded domains.

1.1 A brief outline of the approach

Here we give a brief outline of the approach we take. Suppose (u, v) is a smooth positive stable solution of (3) with $2 < p < \theta$. We begin by showing that stability implies

$$\sqrt{p\theta} \int u^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} v^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \phi^2 \leq \int |\nabla \phi|^2,$$

for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Using as a test function $\phi = v^t \gamma$ where $\gamma \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and using the pointwise comparison $(\theta+1)v^{p+1} \geq (p+1)u^{\theta+1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, which holds without stability; see [25], we obtain an inequality roughly of the form

$$\int u^\theta v^{2t-1} \gamma^2 \leq C_t \int v^{2t} |\nabla \gamma|^2, \tag{13}$$

for all $t_0^- < t < t_0^+$. One also has the following integral estimates, see [24]

$$\int_{B_R} v^p \leq C R^{N-2-\frac{2(p+1)}{p\theta-1}}, \tag{14}$$

which also holds without the stability assumption. As a first attempt we assume that $t_0^- < \frac{p}{2} < t_0^+$ and so we can take $2t = p$ in (13) and we assume that $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ with $\gamma = 1$ in B_R and is compactly supported in B_{2R}. We then use (13) and (14) to see that

$$\int_{B_R} u^\theta v^{p-1} \leq \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{2R}} v^p \leq C R^{N-4-\frac{2(p+1)}{p\theta-1}},$$

for all $R > 0$. Provided this exponent is negative then we get a contradiction by sending $R \to \infty$. Note this implies there is no positive stable solution of (3) for $N \leq 4$ for any $2 \leq p \leq \theta$. Now since we expect v to decay to zero at ∞ one would expect to obtain better results if we can choose $t > \frac{p}{2}$. To do this we examine the elliptic equation which v^p satisfies and we use L^1 elliptic regularity theory along with (13) and (14) to obtain integral estimates on $v^{p\alpha}$ for $1 < \alpha < \frac{N}{N-2}$. We can iterate this procedure, as long as the range of t in (13) allows, looking at increasing powers of v to obtain integral estimates of v for higher powers. These higher power integral estimates allow one to obtain better results.

Remark 3. *The condition $2t_0^- < p$ in the second part of Theorem 1 is needed so as to start the iteration procedure.*

In the case of the fourth order scalar equation we start the iteration using an L^2 integral estimate of $v := -\Delta u$, which is due to [27]. We believe *that one could use the methods developed there to possibly get some integral estimates on v in the case where $p > 1$ which would allow one to drop the condition that $2t_0^- < p$.*

2 Proof of Theorem 1 and 2.

We begin with some integral estimates which are valid for any positive solution of (3).

Lemma 1. [24] *Suppose (u, v) is a positive solution of (3) with $1 \le p \le \theta$. Then*

$$\int_{B_R} v^p \le CR^{N-2-\frac{2(p+1)}{p\theta-1}},$$

$$\int_{B_R} u^\theta \le CR^{N-2-\frac{2(\theta+1)}{p\theta-1}}.$$

A crucial ingredient in our proof of Theorem 1 is given by the following pointwise comparisons.

Lemma 2. *1. [25] Suppose that (u, v) is a smooth solution of (3) and $1 < p \le \theta$. Then if either $2 \le \theta$ or u is bounded, we have*

$$(\theta+1)v^{p+1} \ge (p+1)u^{\theta+1} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{15}$$

2. [27] Suppose that u is a smooth stable solution of (3) with $1 = p < \theta$. Then there exists a smooth positive stable bounded solution of (3), which we denote by $\tilde{u}$ and which satisfies

$$(\theta+1)\tilde{v}^2 \ge (p+1)\tilde{u}^{\theta+1} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{16}$$

where $\tilde{v} := -\Delta\tilde{u} > 0$.

Remark 4.
- *At first glance second part of the above lemma seems a bit strange. But recall we are proving a nonexistence result and hence if we assume the existence of a stable positive solution (u, v) then there exists a stable positive solution $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v})$ with $\tilde{u}$ bounded and this allows one to obtain the comparison between $\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{v}$. We then end up arriving at a contradiction. Because of this result we will always just assume our stable positive solution (u, v) of (3), in the case $p = 1$, satisfies u is bounded.*
- *We suspect that the condition: either $2 \le \theta$ or u is bounded, from the first part of the lemma, can be removed using ideas from [27] and [25].*

The following lemma transforms our notion of a stable solution of (3) into an inequality which allows the use of arbitrary test functions. A bounded domain version of this was proven in [7] but we include the proof here for the readers sake. We remark that this result was motivated by a similar result in [10].

Lemma 3. *[7]*
Let (u,v) denote a stable solution of (5). Then

$$\int \sqrt{f'(v)g'(u)}\phi^2 \le \int |\nabla\phi|^2 \tag{17}$$

for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. Let (u,v) denote a stable solution of (5) and so there is some $0<\zeta,\chi$ smooth such that

$$\frac{-\Delta\zeta}{\zeta} \ge \lambda f'(v)\frac{\chi}{\zeta}, \qquad \frac{-\Delta\chi}{\chi} \ge \gamma g'(u)\frac{\zeta}{\chi}, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Let $\phi,\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and multiply the first equation by ϕ^2 and the second by ψ^2 and integrate over $\mathbb{R}^N$ to arrive at

$$\int f'(v)\frac{\chi}{\zeta}\phi^2 \le \int |\nabla\phi|^2, \qquad \int g'(u)\frac{\zeta}{\chi}\psi^2 \le \int |\nabla\psi|^2,$$

where we have utilized the result that for any sufficiently smooth $E>0$ we have

$$\int \frac{-\Delta E}{E}\phi^2 \le \int |\nabla\phi|^2,$$

for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$. We now add the inequalities to obtain

$$\int (f'(v)\phi^2)\frac{\chi}{\zeta} + (g'(u)\psi^2)\frac{\zeta}{\chi} \le \int |\nabla\phi|^2 + |\nabla\psi|^2. \tag{18}$$

Now note that

$$2\sqrt{f'(v)g'(u)}\phi\psi \le 2tf'(v)\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2t}g'(u)\psi^2,$$

for any $t>0$. Taking $2t = \frac{\chi(x)}{\zeta(x)}$ gives

$$2\sqrt{f'(v)g(u)}\phi\psi \le (f'(v)\phi^2)\frac{\chi}{\zeta} + (g'(u)\psi^2)\frac{\zeta}{\chi},$$

and putting this back into (18) gives the desired result after taking $\phi = \psi$. □

Remark 5. *Suppose (u,v) is a positive smooth solution of (5) which only satisfies the finite domain version of stability introduced in Remark 1. Suppose $\gamma \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ whose support is contained in $B_{\frac{R}{2}}$. If one replaces ζ with ζ_R and χ with χ_R one sees the same proof remains valid and hence we still have (17) for solutions which satisfy this slightly weaker notion of stability.*

For integers $k \ge -1$ define $R_k := 2^k R$ for $R > 0$.

Lemma 4. *Suppose (u,v) is a smooth, positive stable solution of (3) satisfying the hypothesis from Lemma 2. Then for all $t_0^- < t < t_0^+$ there is some $C_t < \infty$ such that*

$$\int_{B_{R_k}} u^\theta v^{2t-1} \le \frac{C_t}{2^{2k}R^2} \int_{B_{R_{k+1}}} v^{2t},$$

for all $0 < R < \infty$.

Proof. Let (u,v) denote a positive smooth stable solution of (3). Let γ denote a smooth cut-off function which is compactly supported in $B_{R_{k+1}}$ and which is equal to one in B_{R_k}. Put $\phi := v^t \gamma$ into (17) to obtain

$$\sqrt{p\theta} \int v^{\frac{p-1}{2}} u^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} v^{2t}\gamma^2 \le t^2 \int v^{2t-2}|\nabla v|^2\gamma^2 + \int v^{2t}|\nabla \gamma|^2 + 2t \int v^{2t-1}\gamma \nabla v \cdot \nabla \gamma.$$

We now re-write the left hand side as

$$\sqrt{p\theta} \int u^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}} v^{\frac{p+1}{2}} v^{2t-1}\gamma^2,$$

and we now use the the pointwise bound (15) to see the left hand side is greater than or equal to

$$\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} \int u^\theta v^{2t-1}\gamma^2,$$

and hence we obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}} \int u^\theta v^{2t-1}\gamma^2 \le t^2 \int v^{2t-2}|\nabla v|^2\gamma^2 + \int v^{2t}|\nabla \gamma|^2 + 2t \int v^{2t-1}\gamma \nabla v \cdot \nabla \gamma.$$

Multiply $-\Delta v = u^\theta$ by $v^{2t-1}\gamma^2$ and integrate by parts to obtain, after some rearrangement

$$t^2 \int v^{2t-2}|\nabla v|^2\gamma^2 \le \frac{t^2}{2t-1} \int u^\theta v^{2t-1}\gamma^2 - \frac{2t^2}{2t-1} \int v^{2t-1}\gamma \nabla v \cdot \nabla \gamma.$$

We now use this to replace the first term on the right in the above inequality to obtain

$$\left(\sqrt{\frac{p\theta(p+1)}{\theta+1}}-\frac{t^2}{2t-1}\right)\int u^\theta v^{2t-1}\gamma^2 \le \int v^{2t}|\nabla\gamma|^2-\frac{t-1}{2(2t-1)}\int v^{2t}\Delta(\gamma^2),$$

and from this we easily get the desired result after considering the support of γ and how $|\nabla\gamma|^2$ and $\Delta\gamma$ scale.

□

In what follows we shall need the following result, which is just an L^1 elliptic regularity result with the natural scaling.

Lemma 5. *For any integer $k \ge 0$ and $1 \le \alpha < \frac{N}{N-2}$ there is some $C = C(k,\alpha) < \infty$ such that for any smooth $w \ge 0$ we have*

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_k}} w^\alpha dx\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \le CR^{2+N(\frac{1}{\alpha}-1)}\int_{B_{R_{k+1}}}|\Delta w| + CR^{N(\frac{1}{\alpha}-1)}\int_{B_{R_{k+1}}} w.$$

Assumption. For clarity reasons we now suppose that $1 < p$ for the remainder of this section. In the next section we return and point out the necessary adjustments needed for the case of the fourth order scalar equation when $p = 1$.

The following lemma will be our starting point for an iteration which gives estimates on higher powers of v.

Lemma 6. *Suppose that (u,v) is a smooth positive solution of (3) and the hypothesis of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Then for all $k \ge -1$ there is some $C < \infty$ such that*

$$\int_{B_{R_k}} u^\theta v^{p-1} \le \frac{C}{R^2}\int_{B_{R_{k+1}}} v^p,$$

for all $0 < R$.

Proof. First note that $2t_0^- < p$ either by hypothesis or in the case where $2 \le p$ since $t_0^- < 1$ except when $p = \theta = 1$. Also a computation shows that $p < 2t_0^+$ and so taking $2t = p$ in Lemma 4 is allowed and the result is immediate.

□

Proposition 1. *(Iteration) Suppose that* (u,v) *is a stable smooth positive solution of (3). Let* $n \geq 1$ *be an integer and suppose that* $1 \leq \alpha_j < \frac{N}{N-2}$ *for all* $1 \leq j \leq n$ *and* $p\alpha_{n-1}! < 2t_0^+$ *(here* $\alpha_m! := \Pi_{k=1}^m \alpha_k$*) and* $1 \leq \alpha_n < \frac{N}{N-2}$*. Then there exists some* $C = C(n, \alpha_i) < \infty$ *such that for all* $1 \leq R$ *we have*

$$\left(\int_{B_R} v^{p\alpha_n!} \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_n!}} \leq C R^{\zeta_n} \left(\int_{B_{R_{3n}}} v^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where

$$\zeta_n := \frac{N}{p} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_n!} - 1 \right).$$

Using the above iteration result one easily obtains the following.

Corollary 1. *Suppose* (u,v) *is a smooth stable positive solution of (3) satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 1. Suppose* $p < \beta < \frac{2t_0^+ N}{N-2}$*. Then there is some integer* $n \geq 1$ *and* $C < \infty$ *such that*

$$\left(\int_{B_R} v^{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \leq C R^{N(\frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{p})} \left(\int_{B_{R_{3n}}} v^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \tag{19}$$

for all $1 \leq R$.

Proof of Proposition 1. First iteration. Set $w := v^p$ and note that

$$|\Delta w| \leq C v^{p-2} |\nabla v|^2 + C v^{p-1} u^{\theta}.$$

We will apply Lemma 5 and so we need to estimate the L^1 norm of the terms on the right. Note the second term on the right is already estimated from Lemma 6 and so we estimate the first term. Let ϕ denote a smooth cut off with $\phi = 1$ in $B_{R_{k+1}}$ and compactly supported in $B_{R_{k+2}}$. Multiply $-\Delta v = u^{\theta}$ by $v^{p-1}\phi^2$ and integrate by parts and apply Young's inequality to arrive at

$$\int_{B_{R_{k+1}}} v^{p-2} |\nabla v|^2 \leq C \int_{B_{R_{k+2}}} u^{\theta} v^{p-1} + \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{k+2}}} v^p,$$

where C depends on k but not on R. From this we see that

$$\int_{B_{R_{k+1}}} |\Delta w| \leq C \int_{B_{R_{k+2}}} u^{\theta} v^{p-1} + \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{k+2}}} v^p,$$

and we now use Lemma 6 to see that

$$\int_{B_{R_{k+1}}} |\Delta w| \le \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{k+3}}} v^p.$$

We now use apply Lemma 5 to see that

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_k}} v^{p\alpha} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \le C R^{N(\frac{1}{\alpha}-1)} \int_{B_{R_{k+3}}} v^p,$$

for all $1 \le \alpha < \frac{N}{N-2}$. We now set $\alpha = \alpha_1$ and rearrange this into

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_k}} v^{p\alpha_1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_1}} \le C R^{\frac{N}{p}(\frac{1}{\alpha_1}-1)} \left(\int_{B_{R_{k+3}}} v^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{20}$$

Second iteration. Let $1 \le \alpha_1 < \frac{N}{N-2}$ and set $w := v^{p\alpha_1}$. A computation shows that

$$|\Delta w| \le C v^{p\alpha_1 - 2} |\nabla v|^2 + C v^{p\alpha_1 - 1} u^\theta,$$

and again we want to apply Lemma 5 so we need to estimate L^1 norm of right hand side. Let ϕ be a cut off function with $\phi = 1$ in $B_{R_{i+1}}$ and compactly supported in $B_{R_{i+2}}$ where we will pick i later. We now proceed as in the first iteration to obtain a bound on the gradient term; ie. multiply $-\Delta v = u^\theta$ by $v^{p\alpha_1 - 1}\phi^2$ and integrate by parts and apply Young's inequality to see

$$\int_{B_{R_{i+1}}} v^{p\alpha_1 - 2} |\nabla v|^2 \le C \int_{B_{R_{i+2}}} u^\theta v^{p\alpha_1 - 1} + \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{i+2}}} v^{p\alpha_1},$$

where again the C can depend on i but not R. We now make the assumption that not only is $1 \le \alpha_1 < \frac{N}{N-2}$ but that we also have $2t := p\alpha_1 < 2t_0^+$. Note it is clear that $p\alpha_1 > 2t_0^-$ since $\alpha_1 \ge 1$ We then use Lemma 4 to see that

$$\int_{B_{R_{i+2}}} u^\theta v^{p\alpha_1 - 1} \le \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{i+3}}} v^{p\alpha_1},$$

and hence we have

$$\int_{B_{R_{i+1}}} v^{p\alpha_1 - 2} |\nabla v|^2 \le \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{i+3}}} v^{p\alpha_1}.$$

Combining the above results we obtain

$$\int_{B_{R_{i+1}}} |\Delta w| \leq \frac{C}{R^2} \int_{B_{R_{i+3}}} v^{p\alpha_1}. \tag{21}$$

We now apply Lemma 5 to see that

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_i}} v^{p\alpha_1\alpha_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2}} \leq CR^{N(\frac{1}{\alpha_2}-1)} \int_{B_{R_{i+3}}} v^{p\alpha_1},$$

for all $1 \leq \alpha_2 < \frac{N}{N-2}$. We now recall what we have (and rewrite it slightly): for all $1 \leq \alpha_1 < \frac{N}{N-2}$ with $p\alpha_1 < 2t_0^+$ we have

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_i}} v^{p\alpha_1\alpha_2} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_1\alpha_2}} \leq CR^{\frac{N}{p\alpha_1}(\frac{1}{\alpha_2}-1)} \left(\int_{B_{R_{i+3}}} v^{p\alpha_1} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_1}}.$$

We now use the first iteration with $k = i+3$ to replace the right hand side to obtain

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_i}} v^{p\alpha_1\alpha_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_1\alpha_2}} \leq CR^{\frac{N}{p\alpha_1}(\frac{1}{\alpha_2}-1)} R^{\frac{N}{p}(\frac{1}{\alpha_1}-1)} \left(\int_{B_{R_{i+6}}} v^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

A third iteration shows: suppose that $1 \leq \alpha_i < \frac{N}{N-2}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $p\alpha_1\alpha_2 < 2t_0^+$

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_i}} v^{p\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3}} \leq CR^{\zeta_3} \left(\int_{B_{R_{i+9}}} v^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where

$$\zeta_3 := \frac{N}{p} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_3}{\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3} + \frac{1-\alpha_2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2} + \frac{1-\alpha_1}{\alpha_1} \right).$$

If ζ_i denotes the the corresponding exponent from the i'th iteration, then after a bit of rearranging we have

$$\zeta_1 = \frac{N}{p}\frac{(1-\alpha_1)}{\alpha_1}, \quad \zeta_2 = \frac{N}{p}\left(\frac{1-\alpha_2}{\alpha_1\alpha_2} + \frac{1-\alpha_1}{\alpha_1} \right).$$

If one now performs an iteration they obtain: suppose $n > 1$, with $1 \leq \alpha_i < \frac{N}{N-2}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $p\alpha_{n-1}! < 2t_0^+$. Then there exists some $C = C(n, \alpha_i) < \infty$ such that

$$\left(\int_{B_{R_j}} v^{p\alpha_n!} \right)^{\frac{1}{p\alpha_n!}} \leq CR^{\zeta_n} \left(\int_{B_{R_{j+3n}}} v^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where

$$\zeta_n := \frac{N}{p} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1-\alpha_k}{\alpha_k!}.$$

One can simplify this expression to

$$\zeta_n = \frac{N}{p} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha_n!} - 1 \right).$$

□

Completion of the proof of Theorem 1. Suppose (u, v) is a smooth positive stable solution of (3) and the hypothesis of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Let $p < \beta < \frac{2Nt_0^+}{N-2}$. Combining Corollary 1 and Lemma 1 there is some $C < \infty$ such that

$$\left(\int_{B_R} v^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \le C R^{N(\frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{p}) + \frac{1}{p}(N - 2 - \frac{2(p+1)}{p\theta - 1})},$$

for all $R \ge 1$. If this exponent is negative then after sending $R \to \infty$ we obtain a contradiction. Note the exponent is negative if and only if we have

$$N < \frac{2(\theta+1)\beta}{p\theta - 1},$$

and after considering the allowable range of β we obtain the desired result.

□

3 Proof of Theorem 2 continued

We now assume that $1 = p < \theta$. If one uses the exact same proof as used in the proof of Proposition 1 but rather than starting the iteration at v^p we start at v^2 one arrives at the following:

Proposition 2. *Suppose that (u, v) is a stable smooth positive solution of (3) with $p = 1$. Let $n \ge 1$ be an integer and suppose that $1 \le \alpha_j < \frac{N}{N-2}$ for all $1 \le j \le n$ and $\alpha_{n-1}! < t_0^+$ and $1 \le \alpha_n < \frac{N}{N-2}$. Then there exists some $C = C(n, \alpha_i) < \infty$ such that for all $1 \le R$ we have*

$$\left(\int_{B_R} v^{2\alpha_n!} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\alpha_n!}} \le C R^{\frac{N}{2}(\frac{1}{\alpha_n!} - 1)} \left(\int_{B_{R_{3n}}} v^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We then obtain the following:

Corollary 2. *Suppose that* (u, v) *is a stable smooth positive solution of (3) with* $p = 1$*. For all* $2 < \beta < \frac{2N}{N-2} t_0^+$ *there is some* $C < \infty$ *and integer* $n \geq 1$ *such that*

$$\left(\int_{B_R} v^\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \leq C R^{\frac{N}{2}(\frac{2}{\beta} - 1)} \left(\int_{B_{R_{3n}}} v^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{22}$$

for all $R \geq 1$*.*

Critical to our approach in the case of $p = 1$ is the following result:

Lemma 7. *[27] Suppose that* (u, v) *is a stable smooth positive solution of (3) with* $p = 1$*. Then there is some* $C < \infty$ *such that*

$$\int_{B_R} v^2 \leq C R^{N-4-\frac{8}{\theta-1}},$$

for all $R > 0$*.*

We now combine Corollary 2 and Lemma 7 and argue as in the proof of Theorem 1 to obtain Theorem 2.

The following lemma shows that the classical notion of a stable solution of the scalar equation (4) does fit into the system framework we have been using.

Lemma 8. *Let* u *denote a positive smooth solution of* $\Delta^2 u = u^\theta$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^N$*, which satisfies* $\int \theta u^{\theta-1} \gamma^2 \leq \int (\Delta\gamma)^2$ *for all* $\gamma \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$*. Then* $(u, v := -\Delta u)$ *is a positive solution of (3) with* $p = 1$ *which satisfies the finite domain notion of stability introduced in Remark 1.*

Proof. Let u satisfy the above hypothesis and set $v := -\Delta u$. As mentioned in the introduction we have $v > 0$, see [26]. Let $R > 0$ and set $X := H^2(B_R) \cap H_0^1(B_R)$ and define the energy

$$E(\gamma) := \frac{\int (\Delta\gamma)^2 - \int \theta u^{\theta-1} \gamma^2}{\int \gamma^2},$$

where the integrals are over B_R and where $\gamma \in X \backslash \{0\}$. Using a minimization argument one sees there is some $\gamma_0 \in X \backslash \{0\}$ which minimizes E over $X \backslash \{0\}$. Note that γ_0 satisfies

$$\Delta^2 \gamma_0 = \theta u^{\theta-1} \gamma_0 + \varepsilon_R \gamma_0 \qquad \text{in } B_R,$$

with $\gamma_0 = \Delta\gamma_0 = 0$ on ∂B_R, and where $\varepsilon_R \geq 0$. Regularity theory shows that γ_0 is smooth to the boundary. We now let γ_1 denote a solution of

$-\Delta\gamma_1 = |\Delta\gamma_0|$ in B_R with $\gamma_1 = 0$ on ∂B_R. Using the maximum principle we see that $|\gamma_0| \le \gamma_1$ and so $E(\gamma_1) \le E(\gamma_0)$ and hence γ_1 is also a minimizer of the energy. Hence γ_1 is also a solution of

$$\Delta^2\gamma_1 = \theta u^{\theta-1}\gamma_1 + \varepsilon_R\gamma_1 \qquad \text{in } B_R,$$

with $\gamma_1 = \Delta\gamma_1 = 0$ on ∂B_R. We also have $\gamma_1, -\Delta\gamma_1 \ge 0$ in B_R and using the strong maximum principle we see these inequalities are strict. We now set $\zeta_R := \gamma_1$ and $\chi_R := -\Delta\gamma_1$ and note that ζ_R, χ_R satisfy the desired properties.

□

References

[1] H. Brezis, T. Cazenave, Y. Martel, A. Ramiandrisoa; *Blow up for $u_t - \Delta u = g(u)$ revisited*, Adv. Diff. Eq., 1 (1996) 73-90.

[2] H. Brezis and L. Vazquez, *Blow-up solutions of some nonlinear elliptic problems*, Rev. Mat. Univ. Complut. Madrid 10 (1997), no. 2, 443–469.

[3] X. Cabré, *Regularity of minimizers of semilinear elliptic problems up to dimension four*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 63 (2010), no. 10, 1362-1380.

[4] X. Cabré and A. Capella, *Regularity of radial minimizers and extremal solutions of semilinear elliptic equations*, J. Funct. Anal. 238 (2006), no. 2, 709–733.

[5] L. Caffarelli, B. Gidas and J. Spruck. *Asymptotic symmetry and local behaviour of semilinear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev growth.* Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 42 (1989), 271297.

[6] W. Chen and C. Li, *Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations.* Duke Math. J. 63 (1991), 615622.

[7] C. Cowan, *Regularity of stable solutions of a Lane-Emden type system*, Preprint 2012.

[8] C. Cowan, P. Esposito and N. Ghoussoub, *Regularity of extremal solutions in fourth order nonlinear eigenvalue problems on general domains.* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 28 (2010), no. 3, 10331050.

[9] C. Cowan and N. Ghoussoub, *Regularity of semi-stable solutions to fourth order nonlinear eigenvalue problems on general domains*, Preprint, 2012.

[10] C. Cowan and M. Fazly, *Regularity of the extremal solutions associated to some elliptic systems*, preprint, 2012.

[11] M.G. Crandall and P.H. Rabinowitz, *Some continuation and variation methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., 58 (1975), pp.207-218.

[12] J. Dávila, L. Dupaigne, I. Guerra and M. Montenegro, *Stable solutions for the bilaplacian with exponential nonlinearity*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 39 (2007), 565–592.

[13] J. Dávila, I. Flores and I. Guerra, *Multiplicity of solutions for a fourth order equation with power-type noninearity*, Math. Ann. 348 (2010), 143-193.

[14] P. Esposito, N. Ghoussoub and Y. Guo, *Compactness along the branch of semi-stable and unstable solutions for an elliptic problem with a singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **60** (2007), 1731–1768.

[15] A. Farina, *On the classification of solutions of the LaneEmden equation on unbounded domains of* $\mathbb{R}^N$, J. Math. Pures Appl. 87 (2007) 537561.

[16] N. Ghoussoub and Y. Guo, *On the partial differential equations of electro MEMS devices: stationary case*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 38 (2007), 1423–1449.

[17] B. Gidas and J. Spruck, *Global and local behavior of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 34(4):525-598, 1981.

[18] B. Gidas, W. Ni and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle.* Commun. Math. Phys. 68 (1979), 525598. MR0544879 (80h:35043)

[19] C-S. Lin, *A classification of solutions of a conformally invariant fourth order equation in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. Comment. Math. Helv. 73 (1998), no. 2, 206231.

[20] Y. Martel, *Uniqueness of weak extremal solutions of nonlinear elliptic problems*, Houston J. Math. 23 (1997), 161-168.

[21] F. Mignot and J-P. Puel, *Sur une classe de problemes non lineaires avec non linearite positive, croissante, convexe*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 5 (1980), 791–836.

[22] M. Montenegro, *Minimal solutions for a class of elliptic systems*, Bull. London Math. Soc.**37** (2005) 405-416.

[23] G. Nedev, *Regularity of the extremal solution of semilinear elliptic equations,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Série I Math. 330 (2000), 997–1002.

[24] J. Serrin and H. Zou, *Non-existence of positive solutions of Lane-Emden systems*, Differential Integral Equations 9 (1996) 635-653.

[25] P. Souplet, *The proof of the Lane-Emden conjecture in four space dimensions.* Adv. Math. 221 (2009), no. 5, 14091427.

[26] J. Wei and X. Xu, *Classification of solutions of high order conformally invariant equations,* Math. Ann. 313(2) (1999), 207-228.

[27] J. Wei and D. Ye, *Liouville theorems for finite Morse index solutions of biharmonic problem*, Preprint.